

## AB 982 Public Advisory Group

Law Offices of Crosby, Heafey, Roach & May  
Justin Roach Conference Center, 27<sup>th</sup> Floor  
1999 Harrison Street  
Oakland, CA

### Meeting Summary

October 27, 2000

**Convene Meeting:** Co-Chairs Craig Johns and David Beckman declared a quorum and convened the meeting at 9:05 a.m.

**Summary of September 13-15, 2000 meeting:** The summary was approved by consensus.

**Timeline and Process for Completion of PAG's TMDL Report:** Leslie Mintz explained that the subcommittee met the previous day to work on PAG's report. A draft of the report was distributed to PAG members, and will be emailed out to all members. To complete the report in time to present to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) on November 16, Mintz described the process that the subcommittee had developed (see timeline table below). Mintz explained that the tone of the report will be neutral and will emphasize areas where consensus was achieved. However, for those areas where consensus was not achieved, each caucus will have the opportunity to express their perspective. The subcommittee decided that these perspectives will be limited to 100 words.

PAG members will have two opportunities to comment. The first will be during the week of October 30 when members will receive by email the version of the report that was distributed on October 27. The second opportunity will be between November 6<sup>th</sup> and November 8<sup>th</sup> when PAG will be able to comment on the next version. In all cases PAG members should submit their concerns to their caucus representative on the subcommittee. As a reminder, subcommittee members are: Bobbi Larson, Tess Dunham, Dave Tucker, David Beckman, Bruce Reznik and Leslie Mintz.

#### **Timeline for Completion of PAG's TMDL Report**

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ACTIVITY</b>
10/27/00	PAG meeting
10/30/00	Subcommittee Conference Call (10:00 a.m.); email draft report to PAG members

11/3/00	Comments due from PAG members on draft report
11/6/00	Next version of TMDL report emailed to PAG
11/8/00	All comments due to respective representative by close of business
11/9/00	<b>NOTE:</b> <i>the previously scheduled PAG meeting has been cancelled</i>
11/10/00	Subcommittee pairs meet to review comments; email amendments to full subcommittee
11/13/00	Subcommittee meets
11/15/00	Subcommittee finalizes report; emails it to State Board staff and PAG
11/16/00	Co-Chairs present report to State Water Board

**Reminder:** *The November 9 PAG meeting is cancelled.*

**Comments by Art Baggett, Chair of the SWRCB:** Mr. Baggett thanked the PAG for its hard work. He also spoke to three items: (1) the SWRCB is holding a strategic planning workshop on November 2, from 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. (This is an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on what they think the Board should try to accomplish, what its priorities should be for the next few years, etc.); (2) how much time does PAG want for its TMDL presentation on November 16? (It was agreed that the PAG presentation would start at 10:00 a.m. and would take approximately 1 ½ hours.); and (3) Mr. Baggett asked PAG to consider what role it might want to take next year, and how often it should meet. He posited that an Executive Committee might meet quarterly, and full PAG might meet every 6 months. It was suggested this could be discussed at the November 16<sup>th</sup> Board meeting.

**TMDL Issues:** For the remainder of the meeting PAG members reconsidered a few issues that to date they have achieved little or no consensus on. This was a last chance to discover if any common ground could be found prior to the finalization of the TMDL report.

**Appropriate Time Periods for Completing TMDLs:** Two consensus points were arrived at:

“The Legislature should provide adequate funding and staffing to allow the State and Regional Boards to immediately initiate the development and implementation of high priority TMDLs.”

“All TMDLs should be established as soon as possible, recognizing varying levels of TMDL complexity.”

**Confirmation of Impairment:** No consensus points were arrived at.

**Legacy Contributions of Pollution:** Two consensus points were arrived at:

“The State and Regional Boards should aggressively use existing legal authorities to identify and hold responsible those parties contributing legacy sources of pollutants causing impairments.”

“Consistent with achieving water quality standards, the Regional Boards should establish a waste load or load allocation for sources of legacy pollutants that are currently contributing to the impairment.”

**Role of Science:** One consensus point was arrived at:

“Science should play a role in the development of TMDLs. The level of scientific understanding and technical rigor will vary for individual TMDLs.”

**TMDL Targets, Waste Load Allocations and Load Allocations:** No additional consensus points were arrived at.

**Public Comment:** Members of the public were asked to comment. None chose to do so.

**Adjourn:** The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m..